




2-1909

Arguments for the Creation of an Under Secretary of State Position

Francis Mairs Huntington-Wilson

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/fmhw_third_documents

 Part of the [Diplomatic History Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

[Click here to let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

18 > In the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Bill there are items to provide for an Under Secretary of State, salary \$10,000; a Fourth Assistant Secretary of State, salary \$4,500; a Private Secretary to the Under Secretary of State, salary \$2,500; and a Confidential Clerk to the Under Secretary, salary \$1,500;- total, \$19,500. As we know, the Senate and House Conferees reported this Bill including the ^{or} items, as well as a provision to make them immediately available. When the Bill was for other reasons to be sent back to Conference, the occasion was availed of to direct the House Conferees to oppose ^{the} to increase by two the number of the higher responsible of- _{Items} ficials of the Department of State.

In these circumstances it is clearly the duty of the House to give serious and unprejudiced attention to the reasons ad- ducible for and against these items as to which there is evidence of some little misunderstanding.

In the first place, the recognition of the urgent neces- sity to increase the number of officials who do the thinking and bear the responsibility for the work of this great Depart- ment is no new idea, no whim of an incoming Secretary of State. The need has long been realized by every close student of the Department of State and the foreign service. We know that Mr. Root recognized it. We know that he warmly advocated this particular increase at a hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and we know from duly reported hearings before the Sub-committee of the House Committee on Appropria- tions how strongly Mr. Root emphasized the inadequacy of his Department's personnel. Moreover, his reported remarks clearly show, as all may read, his conviction that with the vast expansion of our foreign relations, our foreign commerce, travel, immigration, etc., a reorganization of the Department of State would be necessary.

preciation of what the Department of State stands for. We all know that this Department is the point of contact between the Government of the United States and the governments of the other nations of the world. We know that peace or war is sometimes determined by good or bad diplomacy. We have been spending for our naval establishment nearly \$125,000,000. a year, and for our military establishment over \$90,000,000. a year, exclusive of engineering projects or public works. For the Department of State and the diplomatic and consular services combined, and including also appropriations for certain expositions, congresses, and other expenses of foreign intercourse we are spending per year (for 1908-9) ^{figures} \$4,088,752., a sum which would perhaps meet the expenses of a great war for two or three days. Of this total almost a third goes back into the Treasury in consular fees, so that the net cost of the establishment may be stated roughly at the comparatively insignificant sum of slightly more than two and one-half millions.

International relations involving the sensibilities and the interests of all nations are in their nature a delicate subject and the work of a Department of foreign affairs, therefore, must go on in silence, unobserved and unappreciated except when attention is drawn to it by some new treaty, trade agreement or the like actually affecting the interests of every American citizen. The unobtrusive character of this work should not lead us to forget its vital importance.

It may be pertinent at this point to recall to mind by a few examples what the Department of State and the foreign service and their work do stand for. After the Civil War and the practical disappearance of our merchant marine there was a long lull in the activities of American foreign policy. The annexation of the Hawaiian Islands in 1898 forced upon us a political interest in the Pacific, where from early days we had had a growing trade with China and the Orient. Our commercial interests and our influence in China were crystalized

in the "open door" policy of John Hay. We were the first to negotiate a modern treaty with Japan, with which Empire our commercial and political relations soon became close and important. We joined in the action at Peking following the Boxer uprising of 1900. Meanwhile the Spanish War had imposed upon us a still deeper interest in the Far East along with the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and Guam. The same war cast upon us the possession of Porto Rico and a responsibility for Cuba. Secretary Root's trip to Latin America has ushered in a new era of Pan-American relations of the greatest importance. The building of the Panama Canal with its great commercial and political effects makes still more important our position in the Caribbean Sea. These few facts suffice to show that the United States cannot avoid its destiny to be a world power. As a world power the country needs a thoroughly efficient State Department and foreign service.

During approximately the past two or three years the Department of State has been occupied, for example, with the negotiation and signing of twenty-four arbitration treaties, part of the total of some fifty-odd treaties signed during Mr. Root's incumbency. The importance and difficulty of the recent British negotiation in settlement of boundary and fishery questions is well known to any student of our history from one century ago down to this day. There are also included treaties in respect to Panama and Colombia, treaties to protect American property in trade-marks, copyrights and designs, and many others of a technicality and difficulty demanding the application of superior ability. There are the commercial agreements with France and with Germany. There may be mentioned also increased relations growing out of The Hague Conference and other congresses and conferences, such as the Hague Conventions, the Congress on Tuberculosis, the Pan-American Scientific Congress, the International Prize Court Conference, the participation at

commercial exhibitions in Japan and Ecuador, in Belgium and elsewhere, the Congress on Hygiene and Dermography, etc., etc. The Central American Peace Conference held at Washington last winter seems to promise results most gratifying to the United States and Mexico, whose Governments brought it about and guided its progress. The work of assisting Santo Domingo in adjusting her foreign debt was another task. We have lately been concerned in troubles in Haiti. Our Venezeulan questions of long standing and of great complexity seem happily to be responding to a wise adjustment. The Pan-American Conferences, another of which is to occur next year at Buenos Aires, provide a great variety of subjects for careful study, and to the peoples of this hemisphere are not second in importance even to the Hague Conferences, in which we are proud to cooperate for the realization of the ideal of peace and arbitration. You all know that there was also an immigration question with Japan growing out of economic considerations and that that question was satisfactorily arranged. You know also of the recent exchanges outlining the accordant Far Eastern policies of the two Governments. Going back a little further, we recall the work of the State Department in making possible the Peace of Portsmouth. Not at all by way of a complete list, but simply by way of a few examples, I have sought to impress upon the House the real importance and difficulty of the work of the Department of State.

What I have mentioned are results. It goes without saying that these results are the coefficient of a vastly increased amount of work. From the subjects cited, it is clear, also, that this represents not only a vast increase of routine and mechanical work, but, most especially, a vast increase of intellectual work which can be performed only by those higher officials to the number of which it is sought to add two. The difficulty of the work for which the Secretary of State is responsible is greatly augmented by the fact that he has to do

business at long distance through instructions to agents abroad whose usefulness depends entirely upon the lucidity and wisdom of the instructions they receive. The daily guidance of over a hundred diplomatic officers and about a thousand consular officers situated in every quarter of the world and urgently requiring instructions and decisions upon almost every conceivable subject is no easy task. Such is the great unseen work of a department whose personnel on duty in Washington is relatively small. Since 1893 the clerical force of the State Department has been increased by sixty-four. In 1874 there were forty-two clerks and three Assistant Secretaries. To-day there are one hundred and eighteen clerks and three Assistant Secretaries. Just as a ship requires a certain complement of officers in proportion to its crew, so for the efficient direction of its efforts the Department of State requires a certain proportional number of higher officials to manage the different parts of the machine.

As already indicated, a reason this proportion is high in this Department is that that portion of its work which is mere routine is relatively very small because its work is more varied, perhaps, than that of any other Department in Washington, and for that reason different matters have to be distributed in many groups and placed under different supervision. For example, there are matters of trade and tariff and the negotiation of commercial agreements; matters of citizenship, naturalization and expatriation; matters of extradition; peculiar groups of subjects requiring special knowledge of the conditions in different parts of the world; the separate administration of the diplomatic and consular services, the solidarity of each of which must be preserved; the administration of the Department itself; the arrangements in connection with international exhibitions and scientific congresses; arrangements for the reception of and dealing with foreign ambassadors and other representatives, of whom there is a larger number accredited

to this than to any other Government.

Some one has intimated (Mr. Clark, of Missouri) that because our foreign relations are now happily rather serene we should, therefore, not make any additional appropriations for the Department of State. We do not, when the crops are good, cut out as unnecessary the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture! Moreover, it should be remembered that the Department of State is not usually discussing questions of peace or war but is occupied with matters of the utmost importance to the commercial or other interests of the whole country or of individual citizens concerned or resident abroad, either in furtherance of American commerce or as travelers entitled to the protection of their Government. How great are our vested interests abroad and the number of our citizens representing out national life the worl over may be inferred from the estimate that in Mexico alone there are forty thousand American citizens and an investment of seven hundred million dollars of American capital. The increase of foreigh travel may be inferred from these figures:- Our outgoing passengers numbered in 1898, 225,411; in 1906, 496,737; in 1907, 569,882. Immigration has correspondingly increased. Turning to foreign trade, our totals have been, for 1896, \$1,662,331,412; for 1906, \$2,960,426,946; and for 1907, \$3,315,272,503. The Department of State is also likely soon to be called upon, like this body, to occupy itself with tariff questions. How great this part of its work would be if the maximum and minimum tariff were adopted is too evident to call for elaboration. Finally, it may be suggestive to give a few comparative figures to show the volume of correspondence as a physical indication of the recent increase in this Department's work. In the fiscal *year* 1905-6, the number of pieces of correspondence handled totaled 111,992; in 1906-7, 131,186; in 1907-8, 161,846. In 1907-8 the telegrams totaled 6,166.

Thus far in alluding to the Department of State I have

referred to it as a foreign office. It is a singular fact, and one which should most certainly be borne in mind in considering this legislation that in all of the other important Governments of the world the chief cabinet officer and the head of the Department of Foreign Affairs are separate and distinct officials. Only in the United State are centered in one man the onerous responsibilities of being at the same time the chief adviser to the executive head of the state and the Secretary responsible for foreign affairs. With us the Secretary of State is head of the Department handling foreign affairs, a post which entails, in the case of a great country like this, tasks difficult enough for any man's ability. Simultaneously he must be prepared at all times to advise the President upon the variety of those great problems of domestic policy which lie at the root of the country's welfare.

In the discussion of these provisions some one has said that machinery with which Mr. Hay and Mr. Root were able so brilliantly to discharge their duties should be adequate for any one. Mr. Root himself has answered this thought by stating that the machinery is inadequate. He has also clearly indicated that many improvements will soon be necessary. This is no question of the ability of individuals. It is a question of giving to the head of the President's Cabinet, who ever he be, an adequate machine to work with. I hope we do not wish merely to leave the Department of State where it can worry along under a heavy handicap and barely keep up with its work. I hope indeed that we are willing to hold up the hands of the Secretary of State in order that he may be able to bring his Department abreast of the corresponding departments of other Governments and that we shall not deny to this little-understood Department the right to a logical expansion commensurate with the international position, the commerce, the population, the wealth and the pride of the American people.

which has been so conservative in its requests and which has so slightly responded in the increase of its personnel to the expansion of its business as has the Department of State. The Department of Justice employs in Washington a clerical force of ninety-eight persons, not including law clerks and special attorneys. It has a Solicitor-General, at a salary of \$7,500, and six Assistant Attorneys-General, to say nothing of those employed elsewhere and for special cases. The work of this Department is rather obvious to the general public, for it is often engaged in the public prosecution of cases of national interest in which its agents have to meet the leading legal talent of the country. There is a certain analogy between the Department of Justice and the Department of State. The Department of State is also engaged upon the prosecution of cases of interest to the whole country,; but the Secretary of State and his assistants are quietly dealing not merely with the legal talent of one country but with the legal talent and the statecraft of all countries and they are handling problems not only of national but also of world-wide concern. Yet the Department of ~~Justice~~^{Justice has} ~~Justice~~ has eight executive officers, the Attorney General, the Solicitor-General, (a designation borrowed from England, by the way) and six Assistant Attorneys-General (one for the Post Office Department exclusively). The Department of State has only four executive officers, the Secretary of State, the Assistant Secretary of State, and the Second and Third Assistant Secretaries of State. To carry the comparison further, is there not a certain analogy between the position of the Solicitor-General and that of the proposed Under Secretary of State? The Solicitor-General relieves the Attorney-General of the duties of personally arguing the Government's most important cases. The Under Secretary would relieve the Secretary of State by sharing with him his most important work.

In keeping with the genius of our people, the evolution of our Government in its mechanism has been one of growth

rather than fiat. Thus in 1889 was established the Department of Agriculture and in 1903 followed the Department of Commerce and Labor. Each of these Departments was created to relieve other Departments of an unbearable burden and to take as their work a logical portion of the overflow of what could no longer receive due attention under the regime of the time.

It would seem quite plain that the need of two more executive officers for the Department of State, and particularly the need of an Under Secretary, is also one logically grown up with the times.

The weight of opinion of those who have made a special study of the subject certainly places a heavy burden of proof upon those who dissent. Their opinion should be taken as that of those best qualified to know the facts, not as that of persons prejudiced. Here we have the opinion~~x~~ of the Secretary of State, Mr. Root, who is about to enter the Senate and that of Mr. Knox, who is to retire from the Senate to become Secretary of State. Both of these are conservative men of legal training and each has had practical experience as the head of an Executive Department.

After the foregoing it should not be necessary to do more than to state that the Secretary of State should have as his collaborator in his dual capacity of head of the department for foreign affairs and head of the Cabinet, a suitable alter ego to advise ~~him~~ with him, to reflect his views, to act for him in his absence, to attend to his work in either of his capacities when he himself was compelled to give his entire attention to his duties in the other, and to be his right-hand man and his principal assistant and substitute, when necessary, in dealing with foreign representatives and in generally supervising the Department and the foreign service in their whole scope.

Among less considerations may be added the official enter-

taining, which is an unavoidable obligation of the Secretary of State, is a burden to share which he needs some one. At present a vast amount of his time which should rightly be dedicated to the study of the country's problems is consumed in receiving callers and in signing a vast quantity of correspondence. An Under Secretary who could stand in his shoes and assume part of this work could greatly alleviate the present situation, so wasteful of the valuable time of the man ultimately responsible for our foreign relations and as the President's first adviser.

Now as a practical proposition one sees that a high order of ability is required for this Under Secretaryship and that a high official grade is appropriate to such an officer. On the Continent of Europe the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs has the grade of Minister Plenipotentiary, perhaps of Ambassador. Our Ministers plenipotentiary receive ten or twelve thousand dollars a year, and in this country a very able lawyer or a very capable business man would usually receive more. It is from among such men that an Under Secretary of State might be drawn, and as a business proposition it is evident that such a man is not available at the salary paid an assistant secretary. Indeed these offices have usually to be filled by persons willing for the love of the work to perform it for a compensation less than they could gain in private life. So much for the emoluments of the office.

That there cannot be serious objection to the provision for an Under Secretary of State is evinced by the fact that a large proportion of the criticism hitherto heard has been not of substance, not of the office and the need of it, but of form, of the designation and mere matter of nomenclature, - a thing Americans are not supposed to care much about. Some Members have amused themselves by characterizing the designation "Under Secretary" as "monarchical"; others have seemed to scent Anglomania in its proposal. Perhaps a brief answer

to this criticism, which can hardly be very seriously meant, would be to ask whether because the King of England calls a "spade" a "spade" we should call it by another name. The designation is not vitally important. It is thought, however, best to find one which will mark the new office, which is intended to be a higher one, - one between that of Assistant Secretary and that of a member of the Cabinet, - as something new and different. "Under Secretary" does this.

Since this official will deal largely with foreign Governments and foreign officials, it is fitting that his title should be one of cosmopolitan rather than domestic significance. "Under Secretary" also meets this requirement. It likewise indicates the idea that the Under Secretary shall be the understudy and alter ego of the Secretary himself.

The items to which there has been some opposition involve an expenditure of only \$19,500. This is indeed a small sum to allow the chief executive Department of the Government to be properly manned.